

NORTHERN UFOLOGY



THE UFOLOGIST : - What should be
our role?

OCTOBER 1981

NORTHERN UFOLOGY: Published by the Northern UFO Network (NUFON)
8 Whitethroat Walk Birchwood Warrington Cheshire WA3 6PQ
EDITOR: JENNY RANGLES (NUFORA) Cover Design: JOHN WATSON (CHRYISIS)
1981 Subscription rate: £3.60 (Rates liable to change for 1982)

ISSUE 89

EDITORIAL: The Aftermath of a controlled lunacy

One day...perhaps...I will get a holiday not disturbed by UFOs! This time it was the SUNDAY MIRROR destined to ruin two weeks in the Welsh mountains. In a big way. Readers will be aware that MUFORA have been quietly conducting a UFOIN level investigation into an incident which involved a West Yorkshire police officer (whose name we have kept confidential for obvious reasons). As is NUFON and MUFORA custom progress reports on this work were given in NUN (June) and FSR (current issue), but of course we have kept this story well clear of the media (although the spuriously linked death of Mr Jan Adamski was featured in the local press at time of occurrence before we investigated it). Our updated information was given to you in order to acquaint you with what seemed the true facts on an important story. What you may have seen from the media and their sources (whoever they might be) are most patently not the true facts.

It is true that in June 1980 a body was found atop a coal heap in Todmorden. The victim had appeared there mysteriously and death was due to a heart attack. He did, however, have a heart condition, although there were suspicious circumstances surrounding his death (which it seems may have been induced by fear) and the case remains a baffling enigma, despite intensive work on it by police and officials (including MUFORA member Harry Harris, a lawyer, who spent much time and money freely trying to sort out the mystery for the dead man's widow). However, there is nothing but rather flimsy circumstantial evidence to link this death with UFOs... despite what the media and spokesmen from UFO organisations BUFORA and CONTACT said in print. These people have not (to our knowledge) had any contact with the case, other than what they have read, and their comments (possibly misquoted) are certainly erroneous. It is ridiculous to suggest that ufologists are treating the strange death of Mr Adamski as a CE 3! Any link with UFOs at all, whilst provocative, can clearly be seen to be exceptionally tenuous from the facts as published.

The MIRROR front page headlined the case as AMAZING UFO DEATH RIDDLE (Sept 27) and CONTACT UK were quoted as saying it is "the biggest UFO story for years" and creating "world wide interest". Possibly they know more of this affair than MUFORA does as CONTACT are not exactly forthcoming with their information. However, if this is so it is news to MUFORA, the dead man's widow and the police officer!

As for the story that the police officer peripherally involved had undergone hypnosis and recalled a UFO contact on the day of Mr Adamski's death this is in fact a TOTAL FABRICATION. We have no idea where the media got this from. Certainly not MUFORA and not the police officer (whose identity only we know). A series of regression experiments were being conducted (at Harry Harris's expense) with a qualified psychologist in Manchester and memory of a contact was beginning to emerge (although for obvious reasons we had no intention of publishing information on this work until it was completed) As is very clear in FSR and NUN the police officer saw a UFO FIVE MONTHS after the death of Mr Adamski and there is not the slightest amount of evidence to suggest a connection, other than the tenuous ones outlined in FSR (where it is stressed that there may well be no link at all)

Whilst on holiday an urgent telegram from the MIRROR arrived for me asking me to contact them (all expenses paid) about the Adamski death. I did not know where they discovered the story, but I declined anyway. Peter Warrington did, however, phone with concern to find out what they were doing but refused to cooperate. MUFORA were adamant that publicity for this case was not on. The MIRROR refused to give their sources and rudely terminated the conversation. The results you know.

We are still trying to discover how the story "blew up" like this, since there was no reaction to the Adamski death when it appeared locally at the time (although there was no UFO to link with it at that moment of course). It seems that a misguided ufologist, perhaps having read NUN or FSR or both, alerted the media for some reason. If so his motives must be questioned for publicity of this nature is the very last thing we need. Certainly the media have had no access themselves to the FSR or NUN article, have not discussed the matter with MUFORA nor the policeman. Neither did the person who "leaked" this consider the anonymity factor or consult with MUFORA before taking his irresponsible action. And the repercussions are horrific. The police officer (whom his superiors obviously have identified) is in serious trouble. So too is MUFORA. The Official Secrets Act is being dangled. Harry Harris stands to lose a great deal of money, and Ufology valuable data, because all contact between the witness and ourselves must now cease. This all stems from the combination of a foolhardy relationship between a ufologist and the media. It is a very serious warning to every single one of us.

Of course I accept some of the blame. After all it was my reporting of the events to you which created this situation. But this raises a very difficult ethical problem. For I merely reported the facts to ufologists. Did not speculate. Kept the witness name anonymous (which thankfully meant he was not traced by the media). In other words I did all the code of practice asks (including not keeping information from fellow researchers, which is itself a clause) and yet still the most awful situation and consequences have arisen.

Obviously, in retrospect, the best thing to do would have been to publish nothing about this affair... but how would that have squared with our responsibility to provide the facts (but not confidential information) to ufology? I confess I am at a loss to know, and would welcome any thoughts on this difficult question.

NEWS REPORT:

:: HAPI have announced some latest developments, in the East Midlands. Mark Brown (UFOIN investigator and former coordinator of CUFORO in Coalville) has joined the group and the CUFORO files are to be merged with HAPI. With this arrival, however, comes news of a departure. Jean Mayne is no longer secretary. Whilst the HAPI contact address remains 23 Linden Rd Hinckley Leics LE10 0AR the phone numbers are now Hinckley 614013 or 611446. They also announce that the autonomous "Atmospheric Studies" group has been closed through lack of support. Along with NUFOIS, HAPI are researching reports of triangular UFOs. Any group with data they might be able to contribute should write to the Linden Rd address.

:: Walter Reid (17 Lanshaw Terrace Belle-Isle Leeds LS10 3NX) writes to inform that the Yorkshire BUFORA branch, formerly ran by Trevor Whittaker before retirement, is active again. They have agreed to continue cooperation with NUFON. Walter also runs an interesting national venture (which with support from the Center for UFO Studies in the USA might soon become international) Entitled JUNIOR UFO CLUB it specialises in child membership, endeavouring to inform them about UFOs. Membership can either be £1 pa (for monthly newssheets) or £3.50 pa (which adds six issues of the club magazine and a membership card) If you have any young members or interested individuals perhaps you would like to mention this idea which, along with the excellent MAGIC SAUCER, is a heartening sign of the new wave of respectability sweeping over ufology in this country.

:: The position of MAUFOG (the southern group alliance) is under threat. At the last meeting several of the remaining key groups left because they did not see either a purpose or a successful application of the cooperative principle. As an outsider it would seem to me that in trying to be so informal MAUFOG found themselves totally devoid of cohesion and thus inevitably drifted into its constituent parts. But there is still much goodwill amongst groups in the south west (beyond which MAUFOG never really spread) and SCUFORI (a first rate team of investigators) are trying to make something out of the remnants. I wish them the luck they deserve. It would be sad if once more a southern initiative failed.

:: Meetings lined up:

- NOV 14 Nottingham HQ All groups are reminded of this crucial "Code of Practice" meeting when, hopefully, the code will be ratified and its mode of implementation agreed. You are urged to try to have representatives there.
- NOV 21 ASSAP are staging a "meet the people" launch in Stoke on Trent. Details from Hilary Evans (11 Granville Park London SE13 7DY) (SAE please)
- JAN 9 UFOIN is staging an important meeting at the Nottingham HQ. Future plans of the network, its files and possibly NUFON too will be discussed. Any interested group who might not be associated with UFOIN are welcome to send representation.
- MAR 13 Peter Hill sends more details of the BUFORA Conference at the Grand Metropolitan Hotel in Edinburgh (with optional reception on Friday. Dinner on Saturday and coach tour on Sunday) As before a combined conference/rail fare/hotel package is offered. Example cost is £54 from Cheshire. Details: 47A Easter Bankton Murieston Livingston EH54 9BD

NOTE CAREFULLY: Plans for a merger of some form between this publication and UFO Research Review have been temporarily shelved due to technical difficulties. There will be some changes to this publication format for 1982 which will follow the same sort of lines as previously announced. Watch for full details next month.

No group has come forward to offer themselves as hosts of a NUFON one day conference (in lieu of the NUFOIS event in Nottingham now postponed to April) If no group comes forward shortly we may either be forced to abandon plans for such an event (which could not now be earlier than December/January) or MUFORA (who staged the last event in June) could organise another. But it was felt we should offer the role to perhaps a city we have not yet visited??

ELSEWHERE THIS MONTH.... FORTEAN TIMES Summer 81: Is Darwin's evolution a myth? Spontaneous Human Combustion. Incinerated! "All this plus the usual columns of everything weird and wonderful in this potty world." It'll take you all month to read it! "...SUFON publish SCOTTISH UFO BULLETIN 3 with a good IFC spot, and a controversial MIB piece... The covers smart too!... SKYWATCH 40 Almost entirely devoted to a useful reprint of a major Australian piece on data compilation and retrieval. Thoughtful stuff!... UFO INSIGHT 9... The Llanerchymedd debate goes on... and on... and on (see below) plus an interesting interview with Bertil Kuhlemann and news of Scandinavia's impressive Project URD.

A FINAL WORD ON LLANERCHYMEDD... or More "Hokum" from a myth-maker.

I wish I knew what I have done to so upset the Grewe group FUFOR. I do not have anything against their basic stance as self-styled musketeers of what they term 'scientific' ufology (in opposition to the pseudoscientific mythmaking of which I stand accused). To fight for truth is a good thing. But it is increasingly hard for me to accept repeated insinuations that I stand somewhere head and shoulders above folk like Charles Berlitz and Von Daniken (literary mythmakers of an undoubted kind). But then again FUFOR (and others) have said it so often that I am almost beginning to doubt my own integrity... almost!

I always try to be fair answering these criticisms at source (eg the current UFO INSIGHT for example). Indeed I repeatedly credit FUFOR with the good they are doing and accept many of their general points quite honourably. But what do they do? Continue to ignore all this and insist I am deliberately cheating the truth. I clearly am quite an ogre.

Their latest point of attack is my two published summaries of the Llanerchymedd case (where UFOs and allegedly related entities were allegedly seen). These are in Ron Story's UFO ENCYCLOPEDIA and my own book UFO STUDY. I stand accused of perverting truth for my own ends, deliberate sensationalism and maybe even total fabrication. Grave charges indeed which, if in any sense true, would deserve serious repercussions.

Of course, as a writer I am not suprised to receive criticism. Nor do I denounce it. There are times when I do make mistakes (honest ones), and since my work is in the public eye it is fair it be corrected. But such a senseless witch-hunt really cannot be on. FUFOR are entitled to hold any opinion of me and my books that they chose. But when they start saying that I write "hokum" and am guilty of a "grave unethical stance" they are bordering on the slanderous.

I think my letter as published in UFO INSIGHT states my case fairly enough and there is nothing I need add to it in terms of facts. My UFO ENCYCLOPEDIA article was written in late 1978 (based on material I freely supplied to FUFOR of my own volition in an effort to bend over backwards to be fair to them) Would I seriously have done this if I knew it would prove I was lying? Yet this is what FUFOR say. Of course there may be points in the articles not in the notes (which FUFOR admit are only minor) These must have come verbally from the investigators at the time. I really don't have a photographic memory or an obsession with one three year old case so I honestly cannot be sure on that.

As to the brief summary in my book UFO STUDY I told FUFOR at a meeting in Swindon that this was written during the first few months of 1979 but still on the basis of the data I had to hand (which did not include their published report or the final UFOIN case study). They say they can prove otherwise (and presumably therefore that I have fallen through a time warp as I know damn well when I wrote the thing). As "evidence" they cite cases referred to by me elsewhere in the book which occurred during the latter half of 1979. But they totally omit to mention (even though I explained this at Swindon) that a book is written in stages over many months and then takes many more months to go through various steps of publication (200 miles from me in London) before it reaches the shops. Some parts of UFO STUDY were written later. A couple of new cases were substituted for technical reasons at a very late stage before I last saw ANY part of the

4.. manuscript in December 1979. I could have got the section refering to Llanerchymedd back from the printers but that would have been costly and difficult, and since my summary of the case did not seem to me to be grossly different to the one FUFOR had published (rightly or wrongly) and since this was half a page in a 270 page book and so obviously was limited in what was possible I did not do this. But (and FUFOR oddly seem to have missed this FACT) I added two references (by phone to the publishers) One was the FSR article. The other was FUFORs version of the case as published in BUFORA JOURNAL (which I considered the source most accessible to any general reader) Although I have not previously pressed this point it seems to me that FUFOR might be guilty of a "grave unethical stance" for failing to notice this...or could it be because this original BUFORA piece of theirs (with talk of "Humanoids" and military involvement in the UFO phenomenon) is exactly the kind of thing they now like to think only other people write!!!

If FUFOR wish to believe I write for my own ends that's up to them. If they think I jazz up what I write to sell books then they might be interested in a range of letters from various publishers explaining why my books do not sell that well (and neither have been acceptable as paperbacks) I quote..."..we do not expect your books to sell..they are not written in the style most UFO books are.." One day I may write something with the main aim of it selling (after all I do have to live) but my work so far has been serious, honest and free from abnormal degrees of exaggeration..with the inevitable financial consequences. But I do not write books for me or my ego. I write because I feel I have a duty to present the truth (as I see it) to the public. I am happy to let my work speak for itself and let readers of it make their own minds up.

Incidentally, FUFOR try to persuade their readers that I don't get my facts straight. Which is interesting. In the August UFO INSIGHT they say they received the information from me at a Code of Practice meeting in Swindon in April. This meeting was in fact in June!!! One might wonder, on this basis, if FUFOR too are guilty of writing "hokum". I would not presume to claim that they do. What they say often makes sense. But on the basis of their own stance I have just proven they do.

FUFOR might care to know that I will discuss their work on Llanerchymedd in my latest book (currently in preparation) This will be completed at Christmas but will not be published until Spring 1983. I apologise in advance (therefore) for not referring to any of FUFORs articles which may be published during 1982.

P
MORE POINTS ABOUT "UFO STUDY"

In a review of my current book (SKYWATCH 40) David Rees makes several points I need comment on. I am sorry he finds the book Of no value and "very disappointing indeed". But I can't hope to please everybody. He says he does not know who the book is aimed at which is odd as the several page introduction discusses just that question and the subtitle on the cover "A handbook for enthusiasts" was, I thought, self explanatory. It is meant to pass on advice to would-be investigators and researchers. If David seriously thinks most people of this description will gain nothing from a discussion of such matters then he has a far higher view of the level of general UFO information (from enthusiasts not specialists) than I have. Of course, I may well have failed in what I set out to do, but what I set out to do was surely obvious.

Much of the review is spent discussing a case mentioned in the photographic section. This was contained in a paper supplied to me by Les Hall of NUFOS, from which he kindly allowed extensive quotes. He also supplied most of the accompanying photographs. I gather a mix-up occurred between MAPIT and NUFOS over this (which has now been sorted out) but so far as I was aware the facts were as stated in the paper, from which I quote..."The negative (colour) was sent to NUFOS for examination and identification of the object, if possible" I have sent David this paper so that he has possession of the details of the NUFOS analysis work, which naturally I assumed he already had as the case was not a very recent one.

David goes on to disclaim his name being acknowledged in the front of the book. This was merely a courtesy on my part. I credited everyone whose work I used to any extent, and arranged for David (like most) to get a free copy of the book. Next time I will bear in mind that David does not want any such acknowledgement.

Finally David suggests there are serious omissions and that there was a lack of thought in its preparation. Well I gave the book two years of thought but omissions there undoubtedly are. If any reader (including David) would care to suggest some then I can try to improve the work should there be a future edition.

3.. The one David does give is in fact impracticable. He says I should have included a list of NUFON groups so readers could take their study further. In fact I included a whole chapter on just that! I included a number of group and magazine addresses but just one contact address for the north and one for the south so that person could put writers in touch with local groups. This was explained in the text and is happening. To me this seemed a far more sensible idea. The list of NUFON groups from three years ago is over 50% out of date due to frequent comings and goings of groups and address changes etc. Any list I included would have been six months out of date (at least) by the time the book reached the shops and would soon have become totally erroneous. So such a list was certainly not omitted due to a lack of forethought on my part.

RELUCTANT DESPATCHES FROM THE COSMIC TRENCHES

During the last two weeks of September I spent a wet and dismal holiday in the Welsh mountains, already under pressure and considering my future. At the end of that time, after more upsets and serious discussions with Paul, I had reached a crisis. At the moment I feel very much like drastically curtailing my UFO involvement, perhaps even completely.

Why? Is this an empty threat? Am I chickening out? I don't know. But it does tie in with the theme of this issue (supposedly!) and as nobody else bothered to contribute to the debate I may as well discuss the role of the ufologist from the viewpoint of myself. I apologise for the excessive personalised slant of this issue.

I became interested in UFOs as a young outsider who was merely curious. I entered investigation accidentally because, as a teacher, I found children desperately in need of someone to talk who would listen not laugh. Most early cases were easily identifiable. I was not chasing spaceships or paranormal ghosties. I recall one early case, from a village near Crewe. It turned out to be an aircraft ("firing laser beams" as the youngster had put it). Administration came later and came to push my investigations into the background (the reason I think why I later fought back by writing up cases... I needed a contact still with the phenomenon). There was little in the way of investigation coordination on a local level. And so, with others interested in the same thing, I worked to set something up. I got involved in local groups. NUFON evolved from efforts to link our group with others. I became involved nationally with BUFORA (a group I had been a member of since I was 17) And when it was clear there was a great need for better investigation standards UFOIN grew up with its ideals for selective in-depth case studies. To me this seems a natural and inevitable process spread over eight years, with a common linking thread... the desire for closer working unity between ufologists and better standards. This has been the only guiding principle I have ever worked by.

Recently I was put on the spot by a member of the ASSAP council and asked to define a good objective. I said "to work on the basis that the next investigation will be better than the last" This seems a reasonable premise. In the current SKY WATCH a letter quotes David Rees suggesting that ufology relies on both the data from the witness and the interpretation placed on it by the investigator. This is surely true. We can only do our best, but we must do at least that. There are a growing number of investigators (not all within UFOIN, although many are) whose work does get better with each attempt. Via the files at Nottingham this is now available for all to use. For this reason I believe we have come a long way since 1973 and I am proud to think I may have had some small part in this revolution.

But without doubt the bane of ufology is our general tendency to attack one another with ludicrous ferocity. Investigators who work very hard and are without doubt serious are constantly criticised by supposed colleagues usually for the incredibly ridiculous reason that they hold different views about what UFOs might be. Don't we all? If we each held a consistent view it may be the wrong one and where would that get us? There is nothing whatsoever wrong with investigator A asking a witness about past psychic history, if he so desires, and investigator B not doing this but making very precise measurements of angular dimensions. Both approaches may or may not be ultimately valuable. Both approaches may be based on right or wrong pinacles. But ufology is the richer for this variety of approach. For stereotyping in a field as complex and enigmatic as the UFO is I feel potentially dangerous. The only acceptable cause for complaint against a fellow ufologist is if he acts unethically (hence our new code of practice) or without proper standards of thoroughness. We must be allowed individual interpretations of what we need to do over and above a basic minimum standard (which is why UFOIN

adopted minimum criteria in 1979). We have far more in common than our minor differences in approach. It is about time we woke up to that and stopped this insane waste of time. (And I am very conscious of how much space I have wasted in this issue on matters we really ought not to be quarrelling over. We are supposed to be interested in UFOs not in politics or personalities)

I have found myself the centre of many such attacks and I really am at a loss to know why we cannot simply agree to differ on matters of opinion and get on with the job of collecting the facts...collecting them better than before...and by means of research and restrained speculation groping our way towards the answers. All it takes is a bit of goodwill. Let us make a new year resolution for 1982. That every ufologist will work with every other ufologist in a spirit of friendly cooperation. Just what can be so difficult about that?

It is important to listen, and learn, from all sides of the spectrum. Whilst people like FUFOR stick their daggers in me I have never denied that some of what they say makes a great deal of sense. I learn from everyone...even from sceptics (who get listened to all too rarely by over-zealous UFO protagonists). John Watson's very clever cover design superbly sums this situation up. In ufology too few "Wurzels" are prepared to try on all the hats now and again. You really do become a better ufologist for doing so - provided you do not become too attached to any one. I make no bones about the fact that I have dabbled with the paranormalist angle in the past. But I have worn the "nuts and bolts" head too - and my current project has found itself leaning much more in that direction than I had expected than when I set out to write it. That is the excitement of ufology. I do not have any even moderately well-set views about what the truth is. I consider it almost equally viable that the government are hiding alien contact or that UFO contacts are vivid and rare forms of hallucination. I like the concept of UFOs as time travellers. I listen to ideas about almost everything. But I believe almost nothing.

Of course years and years of bitter attacks from ones colleagues when all along one is only doing ones best makes its mark. I learnt in 1977 (after a foolish row with BUFORA for which I was to blame as much as them and from which I am only just recovering) that there is no point in reacting aggressively to criticism. But without this recourse one eventually gets worn down. After all I am not a brick wall. I end up crying to myself, or lying awake for nights of end thinking, "What is the point? I bash my brains out for the subject because I think it might just be important and what do I get? Told that I am a liar, a cheat, a sensation monger, only interested in money and so on..." Is anything worth that?

Recently I have had discussions with the new national body ASSAP (which aims for scientific study of all types of paranormal phenomena and is gaining encouraging support). Since ufology is the one area of the paranormal with a solid investigation base it was inevitable ASSAP should turn to us for a stand upon which to build their network. I was asked was I interested in helping coordinate this national network. Being interested in and conscious of the lack of good investigation standards amongst other paranormal phenomena of course I was. The ASSAP concept makes a great deal of sense. There was no question of imposing ghosts, ghoulies or ga-ga golfballs into the investigation of UFOs. UFO cases must still be investigated scientifically as UFO cases. There must also be freedom of choice. If an individual is interested in other phenomena he could support a UFO group and ASSAP. If not just a UFO group. But the cross disciplinary talents of ASSAP could be of use to ufology, at times. The computer resources index being developed by Bob Rickard for ASSAP both needs UFO data and could feedback data to us. In addition, as ASSAP would come across UFO cases it made sense that if I were involved there would be less chance of competition, which is obviously what we want given that ASSAP is going to be around. I was thus willing to remain within ufology and help out ASSAP, seeing this as beneficial and not productive of a clash of loyalties.

Of course, as was inevitable, not all people agree with this. There are ufologists who cannot see themselves cooperating with paranormalists. Their views I respect and so I have agreed to make no firm decisions until the question can be debated at a meeting in January when we can sort things out. Whatever happens I intend to do the best thing for ufology and there is no question in my mind of the need for the continued quite independant existence of a British UFO system (as exemplified by NUFON and UFOIN). Fortunately, in this instance, those with opposing views have been able to talk rationally and with restraint. There will be no disputes or walk outs, but crucial decisions of one form or another are bound to be taken. Just how far can or should Ufology in this country remain aloof from other areas of the paranormal? There are two sides to that very difficult question and I confess I do not positively know which offers the best alternative prospect.

7.. All the other things which have come to a head in recent weeks (see this issue) have set my mind quivering. I hope I have the strength to pull myself through, because I still believe that ufology is bigger than me, bigger than any individual, and I have (like you all) a responsibility to the world to seize the challenges and overcome the personal problems. I only wish that those who could list "criticising others" as about their chief pursuit within ufology would bear in mind what I consider an excellent motto. "We stand or fall by our results. What you say matters very little. It's what you do that counts." If circumstances force me out of active ufology I am happy to let that remain my epitaph.

LOW DEFINITION INVESTIGATIONS

8123 APRIL 24 Burtonwood, Cheshire 00.00 MIGAP (P Barlow) Level E
Unseen object with R & G spotlights. Palm size arms length. Stationary then moved away. In view 5 mins plus. Two women plus mother and father of one as witnesses.

8124 JUNE 2 Upton, Wirral 22.45 MIGAP (W Alcock) Level E
W LITS low on distant skyline. Moved slightly. In view 50 mins. Occasionally flickered bluish. Moved away behind trees. Man, wife, son & daughter witness.... Star or planet??

8129 AUG 21 Little Bollington, Ches 21.15 MUFORA (J Randles) Level D
Group of teenage children saw 2 Y/W LITS side by side over house. Rushed to see more but it was gone. A/C was there, inbound to nearby M/Cr Airport. AIRCRAFT

MEDIUM DEFINITION INVESTIGATIONS

8074 AUG 30 Burley, W Yorks 21.30 N Mortimer Level D
Man and mother saw Y/W oval in sky (size of moon) It moved across sky disappearing and reappearing over space of 30 mins, before fading away. Optical Phenomenon??

8076 SEP 27 Gt Langdale, Cumbria 23.00 N Mortimer Level D
Same two witnesses as above, whilst on holiday. Large hazy star like shape seen in one position for several minutes, dripping blobs. Shot away at tremendous speed. Could have been a star (venus?) Or a magnesium flare??

8125 JUNE 9 Bentilee, Stoke, Staffs 22.20 S. Banks of UFOIN Level A
Young unemployed man saw 2 W headlamps which he took to be an aircraft. Switched off to reveal dark indistinct shape behind them which moved off.
14pp UFOIN evaluation report suggests witness saw a banking aircraft.

8126 JULY 30 East Midlands 22.45 HAPI Level C
Various reports of a football shaped green object with a tail that moved to the west across Leicestershire & Warwickshire. In view 4 secs. Found to be METEOR

8128 AUG 16 Burbage, Leicestershire 21.35 G. Hall of HAPI Level B
Man & girlfriend in car observed cigar shaped object (size of large cigar at arms length) moving at a 15 degree angle very slowly across their path. Estimate duration as 2/3 mins and were puzzled by slow speed and silence. Moving E-W. Sure it was not aircraft although it had row of white lights resembling cabin lights. Nearest airport is Castle Donnington 18 m North. INSUFFICIENT DATA

8130 SEP 20 Baildon, W. Yorks 18.55 N. Mortimer Level E
Clear blue sky. Student teacher and father saw very high bright W LITS. Watched for 20 mins via binoculars and it remained stationary. It then split into three parts as she was getting a bit bored! The top was a small white cloud. Beneath a silver crescent. At the bottom a faint white light. This sounds like a very slow moving weather balloon caught in a thermal which may have deflated at the end.

TOTAL REPORTS 12 (Inc 2 CE ls - see below) Insufficient data (2) Star (2) (?)
Aircraft (3) Optical Phenomenon (1)(?) Meteor (1) Balloon (1) UFO 2

THE UFO AT THE BOTTOM OF THE GARDEN Summarised from 60pp UFOIN Report

Nuneaton Warwickshire Inv: Mark Brown & Kevin McClure CE 1 An EM

The report involves two sightings by Mrs Reeves, a young housewife who works in Coventry and lives with her husband on a new estate in Nuneaton. The first observation of a LITS variety occurred at 19.00 on September 27 1980 whilst the couple were returning home along the B4102, close to Astley, riding their high performance 500 cc motorcycle.

The phenomenon was merely a steady W LITS that paced them heading roughly East for 4 minutes, before being lost in the glare of Nuneaton town lights. She pulled down her visor to remove the possibility of reflections. Her husband was concentrating on the road and did not see it. Investigators believe, after extensive work, that this is probably identifiable as a light aircraft.

On November 26 1980 (another CE amidst the incredible 7 day UK Wave which I will discuss next issue) at 18.45 Mrs R was in the kitchen cooking. Her husband was watching TV and complaining about strong interference (peaks of light rising from bottom to top of the picture). After about ten minutes of this, the effect worsening, Mrs R left her work and joined her husband in the living room to puzzle over the problem. A few minutes later she was aware of a humming sound and "felt compelled" to go into the garden, which she did do so (alone). Here she saw the garage and a tree, behind the back of the garden, bathed in white light and perceived a yellow rounded object just above the tree (illuminating its branches in fact) with a central flange giving it an appearance not unlike Saturn (odd coincidence for Fortean to take note of as NASA was photographing the planet if you remember!) The object rotated through 360 degrees and the humming seemed to be directly associated. She saw the object descend a little and stop rotating. At this she called her husband but he was too engrossed in the (still disturbed) TV. The object then swayed "like a pendulum clock" for $1\frac{1}{2}$ mins. Now that the object was not rotating it was no longer humming. Suddenly the object rose "with a tremendous burst of speed" and vanished. It had been in view for about 5 mins. Later detailed site reconstruction suggests the object was 75 ft up and 20 ft wide.

Mrs R went indoors, noting the TV was still disturbed, but poured herself a drink whilst debating what to tell her husband. She also put some food out for her pet cats, banging the foodbowls to alert them. But the cats stopped in their tracks! Both Mr and Mrs R suddenly heard the humming again and immediately the cats reacted hysterically, running into hiding. They were not persuaded out until the humming ceased a few minutes later. The TV interference continued for a further 10 mins and then ceased. It did not return (that night or later) and examination of the set by investigators showed no apparent faults. Mr R said he did not go out because he was too frightened!

This impressive case study details what I think is one of the most intriguing cases to enter the UFOIN files lately because of the physical parameters that are associated with this event. It would pay detailed scientific scrutiny. No reasonable explanation has been found (ball lightning would seem most improbable in due of the size and duration of the phenomenon) But, interestingly, nobody else on the estate (questioned a few weeks later) recalls seeing anything or noting any electrical interference. But the R house is the next to the end one and beyond it (where the object was) are open fields. Readers will no doubt recall a few other cases similar to this one from past records (I recall one at Stoke in January 1979 (UFOIN 7901) which resulted in eye irritation)

RETURN VISIT TO BIGNALL END. Summary of 23pp UFOIN report by Stephen Banks
AUGUST 2 1981 Bignall End, Staffs. 20.15 CE1 PSYCHO

29 yr old Peter C was walking to a nearby pub to collect some crisps for his wife and child when he saw the object approach from the SE at considerable speed. He was paralysed for a few seconds on first seeing its vivid colouration and bizarre shape, and he started to shake involuntarily with fear. It looked like a lozenge or



sweet turned on its side with crimson sides and black ends. In the centre was a sizable light dimply flickering ("like a workmans lantern"). As it moved the object oscillated from side to side "like a swaying leaf". It tilted a little and went behind some flats. In an effort to keep it in view Peter ran on to someones lawn, virtually onto their doorstep. It now hovered

over the pub he was headed for, tilted as if displaying its best possible view for his benefit! Determined for support he hanged on the nearest door and virtually dragged an incredulous middle aged woman onto the street. Her husband and son followed and they stood in the middle of the deserted street as the object moved away. The one thing Peter cannot get over (and how often do we hear this!) is the incredible stillness and silence of the warm night (although it was still light and normally the street would not have been deserted for the 1-2 minute duration of the event) Yet there was nothing! Investigation has not turned up any reasonable explanation for this incident which, incidentally, was certainly not the moon!!